Case 2:20-cv-03777-CD.J. Document 1. Filed 08/04/20 Page 1 of 13 CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the civil de	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUC				1 177 1, 15 requ	incu for the use of	uic cicik of co	urt for th	
(b) Philadelphia, P County of Residence	Evenue, Apartment OA 19082 of First Listed Plaintiff EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	Philadelphia		DEFENDANT City of Phila 1515 Arch St Philadelphia, County of Residence	delphia d treet, 15tl , PA 1910 ce of First Lis		Philadelp		ice Dept
(E2	ACEFT IN U.S. FLAINTIFF CA	isEs)				ION CASES, USE T	· ·)F	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,) Graham F. Bai	Address, and Telephone Numberd, Law Office of	r) Eric A. Shore		Attorneys (If Known	n)				
	1500 JFK Blvd, S		idelphia, Ì	PA 19102					
II. BASIS OF JURISDI		One Box Only)	III. CITI	ZENSHIP OF	PRINCIP	AL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in	One Box f	or Plaintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government		,,		Diversity Cases Only,	·)		and One Box fo	or Defenda	int)
Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government	Not a Party)	Citizen of		PTF DEF	Incorporated or Proof Business In T		PTF □ 4	DEF □ 4
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of	Another State	□ 2	Incorporated and of Business In		□ 5	□ 5
				Subject of a Country		Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		nly) DRTS	FORF	EITURE/PENALTY		k here for: Nature NKRUPTCY		scription STATUTI	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 57 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical	Y 🗖 625 Dı	rug Related Seizure Property 21 USC 881	☐ 422 App 1 ☐ 423 With 28 U	eal 28 USC 158	☐ 375 False Cl ☐ 376 Qui Tan 3729(a) ☐ 400 State Re ☐ 410 Antitrus	aims Act 1 (31 USC) apportionr	
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	T	Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPEI 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability	710 Fa A C 720 La R C 740 R	LABOR ir Labor Standards ct ibor/Management elations uilway Labor Act mily and Medical	□ 820 Cop □ 830 Pate □ 835 Pate New □ 840 Trac ■ 840 Trac ■ 861 HIA □ 862 Blac □ 863 DIW	yrights ent - Abbreviated v Drug Application demark L SECURITY (1395ff) kk Lung (923) vC/DIWW (405(g)) D Title XVI	☐ 430 Banks at ☐ 450 Commer ☐ 460 Deportat ☐ 470 Racketed	nd Banking rce tion er Influenc Organizati er Credit at TV es/Commod ge atutory Ac ural Acts	eed and ons dities/
REAL PROPERTY	Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO		eave Act her Labor Litigation	FEDER	AL TAX SUITS	□ 895 Freedom Act	of Inform	ation
□ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	3 440 Other Civil Rights □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Oth	☐ 791 Er Ind	moloyee Retirement come Security Act MMIGRATION atturalization Application her Immigration	□ 870 Taxe or I □ 871 IRS 26 U	es (U.S. Plaintiff Defendant) —Third Party USC 7609	☐ 896 Arbitrati ☐ 899 Adminis Act/Rev	trative Pro iew or App Decision tionality or	peal of
	Other ☐ 448 Education	☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	Ad	ctions					
	•	Remanded from Appellate Court	☐ 4 Reinstate Reopene	ed or	ther District	☐ 6 Multidist Litigation Transfer	1 -	Multidis Litigatio Direct Fil	n -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	1 12 II S C A	ause:	re filing (Do n	ot cite jurisdictional st	tatutes unless d	liversity):			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION	•	AND \$ 00,000		CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND		complair	nt:
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCK	ET NUMBER			
DATE 8/4/2020		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY OF R	ECORD M	Rip				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AM	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUI	DGE		

Case 2:20-cv-03777-CDJ Document 1 Filed 08/04/20 Page 2 of 13

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

	:	CIVIL ACTION
Jamil Boyd	:	
v.	:	
City of Philadelphia d/b/a	:	
City of Philadelphia Police Department	:	NO.

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address	
267-546-01	215-944-6124	GrahamB@ericshore.c	om
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for	
8/4/2020	Graham F. Baird	Jamil Boyd	
(f) Standard N	Management – Cases that do not fall into any	one of the other tracks.	(X)
commonly	anagement – Cases that do not fall into tracks referred to as complex and that need special (See reverse side of this form for a detailed ent cases.)	or intense management by	()
• •	- Cases involving claims for personal injury of asbestos.	or property damage from	()
(c) Arbitration	n – Cases required to be designated for arbitra	ation under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	()
	urity – Cases requesting review of a decision n Services denying plaintiff Social Security E		()
(a) Habeas Co	orpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241	1 through § 2255.	()

(Civ. 660) 10/02

Case 2:20-cv-03777-CDJ Document 1 Filed 08/04/20 Page 3 of 13

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DESIGNATION FORM

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Addiess of Figure 11.	, Philadelphia, PA 19082	
Address of Defendant: 1515 Arch Street, 15th Floo	r, Philadelphia, PA 19102	
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: 6001 Germ	antown Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19144	
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:		
Case Number: Judge:	Date Terminated:	
Civil cases are deemed related when Yes is answered to any of the	ollowing questions:	
 Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered previously terminated action in this court? 	suit pending or within one year Yes No X	
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit yes No X pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?		
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court?		
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights Yes No X		
this court except as noted above.	related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in	
DATE:	ney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff 92692 Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)	
	rey-ur-buil / 110 do 1 laining	
CIVIL: (Place a √ in one category only)		
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:	
 A. Federal Question Cases: □ 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Con □ 2. FELA □ 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 	racts	
 A. Federal Question Cases: □ 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Con □ 2. FELA □ 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 	racts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Con 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights	Tracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Con 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases	Tracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Con 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Con 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify):	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Con 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):	Tracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Con 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): AR (The effect of this certification)	Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): BITRATION CERTIFICATION	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Concepts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): AR (The effect of this certification) AR (The effect of this certification)	Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): BITRATION CERTIFICATION tion is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify: est of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Concepts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): AR (The effect of this certification) AR (The effect of this certification)	Insurance Contract and Other Contracts	
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contract, 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): AR (The effect of this certification of the second of the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and 1. Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): BITRATION CERTIFICATION tion is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify: est of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case	

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JAMIL BOYD

703 Bywood Avenue, Apartment 1 : Philadelphia, PA 19082 :

Plaintiff

v. :

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA d/b/a CITY OF PHILADELPHIA POLICE DEPARTMENT

And

POLICE OFFICER DAVID DOHAN BADGE NO. 4690 (Individually and his Official Capacity) c/o Marcel Pratt City Solicitor City of Philadelphia Law Department One Parkway, 1515 Arch Street, 15th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19102

And

POLICE OFFICER THOMAS LACORTE:
BADGE NO 3693:
(Individually and his Official Capacity):
c/o Marcel Pratt City Solicitor:
City of Philadelphia Law Department:
One Parkway, 1515 Arch Street, 15th Floor:
Philadelphia, PA 19102:

And

JOHN DOE DEFENDANTS NOS. 1-10

Defendants

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

No.

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

I. Parties and Reasons for Jurisdiction.

- 1. Plaintiff, JAMIL BOYD (hereinafter "Plaintiff") is an adult individual residing at the above address.
- 2. Defendant, CITY OF PHILADELPHIA is a municipal entity in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and at all times relevant hereto operated under the color of state law in creating and maintaining a Police Department and Code Enforcement Department was the employer of all named Defendants and had the responsibility of adopting policies, implementing procedures and practices which would create an environment whereby citizens would be safe from police abuse.
- 3. Defendant, POLICE OFFICER DAVID DOHAN (hereinafter "Defendant Dohan") is a police officer for the City of Philadelphia and the City of Philadelphia Police Department and at all times set forth herein was acting under color of state law. He is being sued herein in his individual capacity.
- 4. Defendant, POLICE OFFICER THOMAS LACORTE (hereinafter "Defendant LaCorte") is a police officer for the City of Philadelphia and the City of Philadelphia Police Department and at all times set forth herein was acting under color of state law. He is being sued herein in his individual capacity.
- 5. Defendants JOHN DOES NOS. 1-10 are officials, police officers and/or other public officials acting under color of state law who were involved in the following incident set forth in Plaintiff's Complaint and at all times material hereto were acting under color of state law are being sued in their capacity.
 - 6. Jurisdiction is conferred by 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343.

7. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), venue is properly laid in this district because Defendants conduct business in this district, and because a substantial part of the acts and/or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth herein occurred in this judicial district.

II. Operative Facts.

- 8. On August 17, 2018, Plaintiff was driving a vehicle travelling northbound on Germantown Avenue, with his Chihuahua dog in the backseat.
- 9. At approximately 7:19pm, Defendants allege Plaintiff disregarded a steady red signal at the busy intersection of Germantown and Chelten Avenues.
- 10. There is a camera at this intersection, but Defendants failed to recover the video footage.
- 11. Defendants, Police Officers Doohan and Lacorte activated their police siren, and stopped Plaintiff's vehicle at 6001 Germantown Avenue.
- 12. After Defendants ascertained Plaintiff's name, Defendants advised Plaintiff that he was operating his vehicle on a suspended license and was in "wanted" status out of Delaware and Montgomery counties.
 - 13. Defendants ordered Plaintiff out of the vehicle.
- 14. Plaintiff complied with Defendants' orders, and placed his hands on top the roof of his vehicle, with Defendants directly behind him.
- 15. Plaintiff turned his head to look behind at Defendant Dohan and asked, "Why are you arresting me, officer?" Without provocation, Defendant Dohan grabbed Plaintiff by the shirt, and punched him once with a closed fist to his mouth.
- 16. Defendant Dohan pushed Plaintiff to the ground, causing him to fall face first, hitting his top lip on the cobblestone and concrete sidewalk.

- 17. Defendants allege Plaintiff fell to the floor because he tripped on the curb.
- 18. Germantown Avenue is a historical road, and the concrete sidewalk is cobblestone with a tall, 12 inch sidewalk.
- 19. As Plaintiff is laying face down on the ground, both Defendants immediately jumped on top of him.
- 20. Both Defendants struck Plaintiff in the face and mouth multiple times for several minutes without trying to handcuff or restrain him while laying on top of him.
 - 21. Plaintiff never physically resisted or punched Defendants.
 - 22. Defendants never alleged they suffered any physical injuries.
- 23. Defendants tased the Plaintiff from behind while he was still on the ground, and then placed handcuffs on him.
- 24. Plaintiff was taken to Einstein Hospital, for emergency treatment to his face, mouth, and taser deployment.
- 25. Both Defendants used excessive force during the arrest which caused severe injuries resulting in Plaintiff being hospitalized. His injuries included multiple dental fractures that resulted 4 lost teeth, 14 sutures to his lip, and multiple abrasions to his extremities.
- 26. Defendants first knocked out his two top front teeth. A later surgery required removal of Plaintiff's two bottom front teeth. Defendants also caused lacerations to Plaintiff's shoulders, back, and legs.
- 27. Defendant Dohan has a history of physical abuse, particularly assaulting citizens with excessive force.
- 28. According to an August 2018 analysis of complaints against police reported by Billy Penn and City and State PA, first published in August 9, 2018, Defendant Dohan has one of

the highest rates of Citizen Complaints Against Police Officer of any officer in the Philadelphia Police Department. As of August 2018, the same month Plaintiff was arrested, Defendant Dohan had 19 complaints since 2013, averaging 4 complaints a year.

- 29. It should be noted that, on average, it is unusual for a Philadelphia Police Officer to garner more than 1 complaint a year.
- 30. Although Defendant Dohan has been subject of numerous Internal Affairs

 Department (hereinafter "IAD") complaints, Plaintiff is aware of at least one sustained complaint that is very similar to this current case.
- 31. According to IAD #16-0455, Defendant Dohan has a sustained complaint for physical abuse for assaulting a citizen in his mouth with the butt of his gun causing multiple dental fractures and a laceration on the lip that required stitches. His then partner Charles Klink screamed "fuck your pretty teeth" as Defendant Dohan used excessive force during a routine motor vehicle stop. Defendant Dohan was found to have violated Philadelphia Police Department Disciplinary Code 1-§012 (pertaining to unauthorized and / or excessive use of force).
- 32. That lawsuit was settled on December 16, 2017 for the sum of \$110,000. Eight months after settlement, Defendant Dohan assaulted Plaintiff in this case, in almost the identical situation.
 - 33. Currently, there is an IAD investigation in regards to Defendants' excessive force.

 $^{^{1}\,\}underline{\text{https://billypenn.com/2019/07/16/philly-police-release-hundreds-of-disciplinary-records-for-facebook-cops/}$

 $^{^2 \, \}underline{\text{https://www.cityandstatepa.com/content/philly-police-identify-cops-named-hundreds-civilian-complaints}$

- 34. Furthermore, Defendants, Dohan and LaCourte stole Plaintiff's Chihuahua dog from the backseat of the vehicle when Plaintiff was in custody, and placed the dog at the nearest animal shelter without Plaintiff's permission.
- 35. The animal shelter's paperwork reveal Defendants dropped off Plaintiff's Chihuahua dog one hour later the same day at 8:27pm, at Animal Care & Control Team of Philadelphia, located at 111 W. Hunting Park Avenue. Defendants falsely avowed on the discharge paperwork that "to the best of [their] knowledge, this is a stray or unowned animal."
- 36. After Defendants took Plaintiff's Chihuahua dog and lied to shelter that it was a stray, Plaintiff filed a Lost Dog report on August 21, 2018.
- 37. When confronted about where is the Chihuahua dog during a Motion in Limine hearing, Defendant Dohan testified:

Q: Do you recall what happened to the dog?

A: Yep. It was taken to PACA.

Q: Is there a reason it's not part of the paperwork?

A: Why would it be? It had nothing to do with the arrest.

First Judicial District of Pennsylvania court hearing 11/22/19, pp 28.

- 38. Unfortunately, Plaintiff never found his Chihuahua dog due to Defendants' deceitful behavior.
 - 39. There is no mention of Plaintiff's Chihuahua dog in the Defendants' paperwork.
- 40. There is no mention of Defendants' paperwork of Plaintiff's teeth being knocked out.
- 41. After Plaintiff was in custody, Defendants stated that for the first time, they now smelled a strong odor of marijuana emanating from the vehicle, and recovered from on top of the front passenger seat underneath the bag was various narcotics and a loaded firearm.

42. The criminal case is currently pending jury on February 1, 2021 in the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas.

III. Causes of Action.

COUNT I – 4th AMENDMENT--MALICIOUS PROSECUTION (42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 et seq)

- 43. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1-42 as if fully set forth at length herein.
- 44. At all times described above, Defendants were acting under color of state law.
- 45. As described above, Defendants initiated a criminal charge against Plaintiff.
- 46. As described above, Defendants initiated criminal charges with malice.
- 47. All charges described above are currently pending against the Plaintiff.
- 48. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff sustained significant damages, including but not limited to: great economic loss, future lost earning capacity, lost opportunity, loss of future wages, loss of front pay, loss of back pay, as well as personal injury, emotional distress, mental anguish, humiliation, pain and suffering and consequential damages.
- 49. As a result of the conduct of Defendants' owners/management, Plaintiff hereby demands punitive damages.
 - 50. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983, Plaintiff demands attorneys fees and court costs.

COUNT II – 4th AMENDMENT--WRONGFUL ARREST (42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 et seq)

- 51. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1-50 as if fully set forth at length herein.
- 52. At all times material hereto, Defendants were acting under color of state law.
- 53. As described above, Defendants arrested Plaintiff without reasonable suspicion or probable cause that she committed a criminal offense.

- 54. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff sustained significant damages, including but not limited to: great economic loss, future lost earning capacity, lost opportunity, loss of future wages, loss of front pay, loss of back pay, as well as emotional distress, mental anguish, humiliation, pain and suffering and consequential damages.
- 55. As a result of the conduct of Defendants' owners/management, Plaintiff hereby demands punitive damages.
 - 56. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983, Plaintiff demands attorneys fees and court costs.

COUNT III -4th AMENDMENT—EXCESSIVE FORCE (42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 et seq)

- 57. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1-56 as if fully set forth at length herein.
- 58. At all times material hereto, Defendants were acting under color of state law.
- 59. As described above, Defendants intentionally applied an unreasonable and excessive level of force towards Plaintiff, and exercised such force with no other lawful purpose or justification.
- 60. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff sustained significant damages, including but not limited to: Personal injury, great economic loss, as well as emotional distress, mental anguish, humiliation, pain and suffering and consequential damages.
- 61. As a result of the conduct of Defendants', Plaintiff hereby demands punitive damages.
 - 62. Plaintiff demands attorneys fees and court costs.

COUNT IV —MONELL CLAIM (42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 et seq)

63. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1-62 as if fully set forth at length herein.

- 64. At all times material hereto, Defendants instituted policies and procedures within the police department, specifically as concerns Defendant Dohan with indifference to the constitutional rights of the citizens of Philadelphia, including, but not limited to Plaintiff.
- 65. Those policies and procedures include creating and fostering an environment through failures to train and hire suitable police officers and a failure to supervise those officers.
- 66. As a proximate result of Defendants' policies and procedures, Plaintiff sustained significant damages, including but not limited to: Personal injury, great economic loss, future lost earning capacity, lost opportunity, loss of future wages, loss of front pay, loss of back pay, as well as emotional distress, mental anguish, humiliation, pain and suffering and consequential damages.
- 67. As a result of the conduct of Defendants', Plaintiff hereby demands punitive damages.
 - 68. Plaintiff demands attorneys fees and court costs.

IV. Relief Requested.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Jamil Boyd demands judgment in his favor and against Defendants jointly and severally, in an amount in excess of \$200,000.00 together with:

- A. Compensatory damages, including but not limited to: Personal injury damages, deprivation of constitutional rights, injury to reputation, mental and emotional distress, pain and suffering, economic loss, deprivation of her liberty and property interests,
- B. Punitive damages;
- C. Attorneys fees and costs of suit;
- D. Interest, delay damages; and,

E. Any other further relief this Court deems just proper and equitable.

LAW OFFICES OF ERIC A. SHORE

GRAHAM F. BAIRD, ESQUIRE

Two Penn Center 1500 JFK Boulevard, Suite 1240 Philadelphia, PA 19102 Attorney for Plaintiff, Jamil Boyd

Dated: August 4, 2020